1	1	
2	2	
3	3	
4	1	
5	5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	* * *	
9	DILYARA M. CANNON,	
10	Plaintiff,	2:10-CV-0909-LRH-RJJ
11	1 v	<u>ORDER</u>
12	ARON ROGERS; et al.,	<u>onder.</u>
13	Defendants.	
14	1	
15	Before the court is defendants Sandhya Wahl-Gururaj and Aron Rogers' (collectively	
16	"defendants") motion to dismiss plaintiff Dilyara M. Cannon's ("Cannon") amended complaint.	
17	7 Doc. #28. ¹	
18	On June 14, 2010, Cannon filed a complaint against defendants in their official capacity	
19	asserting a violation for civil racketeering. Doc. #1. Moving defendants filed an initial motion to	
20	dismiss. Doc. #8. After defendants filed their initial motion, Cannon filed an amended complaint	
21	against defendants which withdrew the initial complaint's official capacity claims, instead alleging	
22	individual capacity claims against defendants for fraud and civil racketeering. See Doc. #16.	
23	Thereafter, defendants filed the present motion to dismiss incorporating in its entirety their initial	
24	motion to dismiss. See Doc. #28.	
25	5	
26	¹ Refers to the court's docketing number.	

The court has reviewed the documents and pleadings on file in this matter and finds that 1 2 the incorporation of the initial motion to dismiss fails to address the new allegations in the 3 amended complaint. In particular, the initial motion contains arguments concerning the issue of 4 sovereign immunity relating to the original complaint's official capacity claims as well as the issue of improper venue due to a binding arbitration clause involving the defendants' employer, the 5 Nevada System of Higher Education ("NSHE"), which are not alleged in the amended complaint. 6 The defendants' contention that the allegations in the amended complaint are so identical to those 8 in the initial complaint as to warrant incorporation of their initial motion to dismiss is incorrect. 9 Therefore, the court shall deny defendants' motion to dismiss without prejudice and grant the 10 defendants an opportunity to respond to the new allegations and claims in the amended complaint. 11 12 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendants' motion to dismiss (Doc. #28) is DENIED 13 without prejudice. Defendants Sandhya Wahl-Gururaj and Aron Rogers shall have ten days from 14 entry of this order to file a renewed motion to dismiss. 15 IT IS SO ORDERED. Elsihe 16 DATED this 15th day of January, 2011. 17 18 LARRY R. HICKS 19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 20 21 22 23 24 25 26